

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, March 1, 1985

Present: R.M. Roy, Chairman; D. Taddeo; J. Chaikelson; M. Singer; B. Smart; J. Princz; C. Bertrand; R. Cronin, s.j.; D. Dicks; M. Doughty; J. Doyle; J. Drysdale; H. Shulman; C. Langford; J. Locke; D. McDougall; D. Markiewicz; S. McEvenue; S. Misra; G. Newsham; M. Oppenheim; R. Pallen; H. Proppe; E. Raudsepp; B. Sahni; O. Schwelb; G. Trudel; G. Valaskakis; L. Van Toch; C. White; J. Poisson; S. Byer; L. Gray; A. Leber; S. Cappelli; R. Lachance; A. Legault; H. Perlman; A. Saikaley; M. Trepanier; B. St. Laurent.

Absent with Regrets: C. Barton; A.M. Ketter; C. Ross; J. Young; D. Konig; D. Marjama; D. Vlassopoulos.

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 1:40 p.m.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The Chairman asked to have an item on the election of a student representative to the Steering Committee included on the agenda as item 5a.

85-3-1 It was moved and seconded (Proppe/Cappelli) to approve the agenda as amended.
Vote: Carried

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Chairman reported that the minutes of the meeting of January 11th are still in production. He said that Steering Committee was having some difficulty in coming to grips with the final version of the minutes and would be looking at those next week. He asked for a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting of February 1st.

85-3-2 It was moved and seconded (Proppe/Misra) to approve and adopt the minutes of the meeting held on February 1, 1985.

Prof. Drysdale asked to have the year shown on page 4, line five of the second paragraph changed to 1983 from 1984. Attention was drawn to a typographical error in the same paragraph.

Dean Roy noted that Prof. Frost had attended the meeting to take part in the discussion on Computer Usage in the Arts and Science (Item 5), but that his name had been inadvertently omitted from the attendance list.

The minutes as corrected were approved.

4. CHAIRMAN'S REMARKS

The Chairman recalled that at the last meeting of Council there was some discussion about registration procedures that would apply to the Faculty of Arts and Science and at that time it appeared that there would be no early time-slots available for the Faculty; that students would only register after May 15th. He said that the situation has been resolved to some extent. Registration will take place for Arts and Science students on March 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, April 4, 9, 10, 11, 12, and after May 15th. The Committee working on registration has provided some information to the Assistant Dean Student Affairs Office and to Divisional Dean and Provost for dissemination to Departments. He noted that this is a new procedure and that there may be difficulties, the first of which is the mobilizing of academic advising to meet the demands that may arise since the process is compulsory and students will have to have a form signed by an Advisor in order to carry out the registration process. Students will be required to pay a larger deposit and will, essentially, be guaranteed their courses.

Council members were informed that the Assistant Dean Student Affairs has scheduled a number of meetings with the Department Advisors and it was said that it would be time well spent for them to attend to learn what the new procedures are for registration since this is a new system which is to replace the former early registration and normal registration periods of previous years.

Dean Roy reported that the results of elections to the Search Committee for Dean of Arts and Science are presented in the February 28th issue of the Thursday Report as well as the other appointments to that Committee.

5. QUESTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

No questions were asked and no announcements were made.

5a. ELECTIONS

Student Representative to Steering Committee

85-3-3 It was moved and seconded (Drysdale/Legault) to approve the nomination of Sharon Byer as the student representative on Steering Committee.

Vote: Carried

6. RESTRUCTURING OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

The Chairman noted that there were two documents to be considered: one from the last meeting of Council, ASFC 85-3-D1, a reformulated motion of Steering Committee regarding the representation of Vice-Deans on Senate,

Board of Graduate Studies, and other bodies; and ASFC 85-3-D1, excerpt of the minutes of the meeting of Senate in which the Rector's remarks are documented regarding a number of questions which arose at the last meeting of Council concerning the procedures at the Board of Governors and the fate of the resolutions of Council. Distribution of the document was at the request of the Rector who feels that the report is a fairly accurate representation of the situation as far as he is concerned.

Dean Roy said that he would first like to deal with the motion from Steering Committee and then to discuss what Council expects Steering Committee to do in the way of initiating planning on the transition to the new structure. He said that the Committee has already done some things but before embarking on the laborious task of collecting data and making suggestions for debate at Council it would be useful to have some preliminary discussion. He recalled that there was some concern about Steering Committee doing this task and thought this to be an opportunity for those who would like to see a different group undertake the task to address the problem.

85-3-4

It was moved and seconded (Misra/Proppe) that Council recommend that Vice-Deans serve on Council, Senate, and the Board of Graduate Studies, and that in order to give the largest Faculty in the University an adequate voice administratively, Vice-Deans be invited to participate in interfaculty decanal consultative bodies.

During the discussion on the motion several amendments were suggested, but none was voted on, including the notion that the motion be constructed as given in the Rector's document and that it be recommended that the provision be carried beyond the "transitional period"; that the thrust of the motion should be to place the Vice-Deans in a position equal to Deans of other Faculties in so far as matters outside the Faculty are concerned, and to distinguish them from Assistant and Associate Deans. Also, it was thought that the motion should be divided so that the first part could be directed to the Rector while the latter could be sent to the new Dean since it refers to an administrative problem.

Prof. Sahni pointed to the fact that Council is experiencing a difficult time trying to determine what its role is now given the structure that has been imposed. He noted that the Rector, Senate, and the Board of Governors seem to have recognized that whatever happens in the future is still open, given the fact that there will be one Dean and four Vice-Deans. He thought that Council should concentrate on trying to formulate what it would like the new structure to look like given this framework.

Dean Roy expressed his feeling of uneasiness after listening to the debate and wondered if it was meaningful in any way to pass the motion on the floor at this time.

It was proposed that one option might be to defeat the motion at this point and to bring it up as one of the aspects in the restructuring of the Faculty that Steering Committee could include in the package it will prepare for Council's consideration.

85-3-5

It was moved and seconded (Singer/Valaskakis) to table the motion.

Vote: Carried

Dean Roy outlined the Steering Committee's approach in trying to initiate discussion on the transition of the Faculty and suggested that it intended to proceed with some vigor during the month of March to prepare something for discussion in Council in April. He said that up to now the Committee has attempted to collect, modify, and correct organizational charts of the Divisions and the Faculty as a whole; that he has consulted with Divisional Deans and Provost essentially to prepare an inventory of duties and responsibilities, both within Divisions and Faculty-wide, to come up with a total listing of the jobs that have to be done in the current year and every year and to try to make some sense of the calendar or critical path of what are the events that have to be done at certain times of the year. Steering Committee will then put together a package of material to go out to Department Chairman, Principals, and Directors to solicit some reaction and comment on how they, as heads of units, interact with their units and the Office of the Dean. Steering Committee had had at least a preliminary discussion on possible configurations of administrators within the general guidelines approved by the Board and will be preparing something, perhaps trying to form models within that basic structure ranging from something which is relatively close to what is in existence today to having Vice-Deans having full Faculty-wide responsibility for curriculum, student affairs, personnel, etc. The other thing that is currently being worked on is the attempt to put together some descriptions of the administrative structures in known Arts and Science Faculties in Canada. Dean Roy stated that the Committee believes that it would be reasonable to consider having special meetings of Council in April and since the regular meeting is set for the 19th, it is conceivable to run meetings on the 12th and 26th. Finally the Chairman asked members of Council to discuss the topic of what Steering Committee can do to enable Council to give some reaction and comment on this rapidly approaching transition and on things we can do to make it smoother and better.

Provost Singer thought the issues should be addressed not with the idea of constricting the freedom of the new administrator in the new structure and hoped that Council would mainly have discussion on the sense of Council about clusters, the sense of Council about certain types of administrative models. He hoped, too, that Steering Committee would pay attention to the transition of the summer since as of July 1st there will be no Deans, no Provost and no Assistant or Associate Deans.

Dean Taddeo did not consider the transition over the summer period to be a great difficulty because there are people who will ensure permanence, Department Chairmen, Principals and full-time faculty members, and people who hold responsible administrative positions in the University. He agreed that it would be useful to have three or four models to present to the incoming Dean, but on the other hand he would not want Departments or Council to have to repeat the process that was conducted last year in soliciting submissions for models for the Faculty. He hoped that the members of the Search Committee would be alert and responsible as far as questioning whatever candidates that appear before them about what they would perceive as being a workable model for the Faculty.

Prof. Newsham suggested that if there are to be special meetings of Council, one could be used to work in small discussion groups followed by an open forum to discuss the findings of each group; in that way people who seldom speak in Council would have the opportunity to speak and in addition some of the kinks of each model could be resolved before a general discussion was held.

Prof. Valaskakis clarified her view of the work of the Steering Committee as that of structuring the transition and that the data to be collected was to do not with structures but with how the structures function.

Prof. Markiewicz stated that the structure we have now is one that is not defined in terms of the needs of the institution and is the result of not having done this in the past. She thought that it might well be a task that could be undertaken by some group other than Steering Committee.

Prof. Proppe hoped that the people who have served as Deans and Provost would identify the problems intrinsic to the whole structure, and problems that are not necessarily related to structure but those that people, especially Steering Committee, might not be aware of, and to address the questions of needs. He asked if it was the sentiment of Council to talk about the composition of search committees and if they should, in fact, be in place when the new Dean is announced so that right away the business of searching the Vice-Deans could get underway.

Prof. Oppenheim thought that it was not worthwhile to propose structures since the Rector had stated in his comments to Council that the new Dean would be making a lot of the decisions and where the Dean thought it appropriate he would ask for Council's advice. He thought it important for the data to be collected for the Dean's use and did not think it wise to set up search committees now since it was made clear that it would be up to the Dean to decide whether or not there would be search committees.

Provost Singer suggested that as a compromise between the various points of view Council could elect a transition liaison committee solely to help in the transition and convey information if Council did not want to make decisions or collect data, but his own advice to Steering Committee is to collect data and to present Council with alternatives.

Prof. Langford said that he assumed that what he was hearing was the voice of exhaustion, but if indeed his position differed from that of Council as he seemed to be hearing he did not think that he should remain on Steering Committee. He reviewed his 25-year career as an academic and the elements that made him recognize that the management of an academic institution involves two quite distinct elements, one of which indeed might demand managerial skills which are not democratically distributed but the other was absolutely essentially dependent upon the emerging collectivity of the remarkable variety of intellectual perspectives that put together an institution that deserves the name of university, and assumed that since these two functions are inexorably mixed and there is no such thing as an administrative decision with no academic consequences, nor an academic decision with no administrative significance. He referred to an article from Change magazine about an empirical study done by a professor in a faculty of management who argues that it does not work to manage universities from the top, no more than it works to have a department chairman make decisions in the isolation of his office or to have a Dean decide which departments belong in which clusters, or for a Vice-Rector to decide what is the boundry between professional and non-professional activities in one Faculty or another. He said that the development of things which lead to bodies like this, however

awkward, ineffective, contentious they may be, being responsible for trying to clarify the institution's academic priorities and to render advice, which in general is not advice in a mild sense but advice which is ignored at peril by administrators, involves continuing to confront these things. He said that to sit out and accept that we put together a pile of paper and hand it over to the new Dean means that the past two years, which may not have been pleasant, are going to have been pointless as well. The philosophy with which he had approached the task that faces the Steering Committee was to try to assimilate as best he could the significance of the decisions that were made by the Council over the last few years in conjunction with some decisions that have been made very recently by the Rector and the Board and try to begin to find out what kinds of models lead to the meshing of these two in a way which reflect the position adopted by Council and reflect the sense of Council, and to point out that there are certain things that meet the academic needs that the Faculty has in mind and to recommend one of several models to the Dean for consideration. He noted that in the current structure the Deans were not given a tabula rasa on which to write their preferred model of organizing things, nor should the new Dean. He concluded by saying that some tough battles have been fought and some bruises of those battles are still there, but that there is a reasonable willingness on the part of people who think they have taken some severe losses on the structure of the Faculty. To say now that all this has been done only to hurt each other and not to accomplish anything was to him a great disappointment and a waste of his time. He tendered his resignation from the Steering Committee to the Chairman of Council saying that if what he had said is as far from what many people on Council have been saying he had no business being on the Committee.

Dean Roy replied that it was not clear yet entirely what Steering Committee will be preparing and that that could only be determined after further discussion.

Prof. Sahni suggested that there were two questions Council was trying to tackle: 1) concerning transition which was a purely mechanical question and he thought that could be easily handled if Council would ask the Deans and Provost to make a recommendation on how it should be handled, and 2) that three members of Steering Committee had spoken very eloquently on what has to be done concerning structure and if the Committee is not asked to continue the task the Council would not be fulfilling its role.

Dean Chaikelson stressed that whatever happens is going to happen very quickly in the summer because Deans, Provost, Vice-Rector, Assistant and Associate Deans and other staff will be disappearing at the end of June so that the window of July 1st-August 15th is a critical one and it is essential for Council to decide what is going to be the consultative body that the Dean must consult even if he or she is only going to make temporary appointments of Vice-Deans. From that point it will depend on who the Vice-Deans are and whether or not they have already planned how the Faculty will be run. She said that the steps Steering Committee has taken to collect data are essential and must be continued. As to the Council being able to discuss the structure or come to a decision about the structure that was something she was wary about. She thought that debate should occur in the presence and under the leadership of the new Dean and that Faculty Council should now concentrate on the transition committee.

Replying to Prof. Langford's remarks, Provost Singer said that he did not disagree with his philosophical position, that it is a position that he shared for more than two years, but he has come to feel that many of the debates and most of the decisions that have been made in Council have been relatively meaningless in terms of whether or not they will be listened to, and while he believes in the residual right of the Faculty to govern the University one has to ask the question of is it worthwhile to have another series of special meetings in order to reach a consensus which in all probability is not binding on someone yet unknown and may be from the pragmatic point of view useless to the end result.

Dean Taddeo agreed that tradition is changing in the University and that Council and faculty were largely responsible for that situation existing in the Faculty of Arts and Science. He suggested that if the integrity of the Faculty had been maintained in terms of the decision that was taken last year it would be easier for him to agree to spend more time now to make sure that the structure that is put in is the one Council wants. He said that the process which was completed last year was a process which provided for every point of view to be expressed, that a vote was taken, and that a certain amount of disillusionment set in with him when he saw that that decision taken by Faculty Council was one that was contested at every level of the University in public and private forums.

Prof. Dicks said that his view of Steering Committee's objective was to listen to the types of concerns that might be expressed and that he was rather alarmed about the possibility of choosing from amongst models. He saw it as a collection of data on what happens in Arts and Science for discussion of what might happen to these tasks, particularly tasks that are not in job descriptions. One concern was that of what might happen to these in the transition period. It might be necessary to provide procedures to prevent jobs being lost over the summer and in the future.

Prof. Proppe admitted to a feeling of distress by the rather cynical statements made by Provost Singer and Dean Taddeo. He said that he would like to know if the Council did not think it worthwhile to debate, or to take any action, to take its responsibility. He stressed that this is the forum where this kind of issue should be discussed and if Council did not think it worthwhile he did not want to waste his time on Steering Committee.

On a point of privilege Provost Singer stated that he did not think he was being cynical, he thought he was being realistic.

From the discussion that had taken place Dean Roy said that there seemed to be general agreement about the validity of collecting data or providing information for the Dean, for preparing contingencies if there is no Dean, and for establishing some body for the summer for the Dean to consult. With regard to the more difficult issue of models, he said that he thought he should take some responsibility for that because he was the one who introduced the concept and was preparing material for Steering Committee to look at, but he was not sure that they could be debated or that a choice ought to be made. However, he thought that it would be useful to think in terms of models at some point because he could not see how we could operate otherwise.

Prof. Langford said that he was the drafter of the language of the motion which set Steering Committee off on this particular task, although when it was drafted first it was intended to aim it at someone else and the Council aimed it at Steering Committee, it was understood by the language when he wrote "plan for the structure and transition" that there were two tasks and the message of this meeting is that only one of those tasks is desired by Council, consequently, as a small matter of personal privilege he wished to make it clear that his resignation from Steering Committee is not in any anger, nor should it be, but in the sense that he does not represent the view that Council is expressing and he does not think that it is appropriate to be involved intimately in as central a debate when he is at variance with what he perceives to be a clear majority view of the Council.

Prof. Proppe stated that he did not plan to resign from Steering Committee just yet and wished to clarify what he had in mind concerning the issue of models. He said that it was never his intention that Steering Committee come to Council with two or three models and have a debate on which one is best for the new Dean to adhere to, but in order to organize the kind of information that is going to be collected and to present it in a coherent fashion it makes more sense to have, at least, partial models or options to provide a skeletal framework around which to organize the logic of the debate. He agreed with Prof. Langford that it would be an abdication of responsibility to simply sit back and say that it would be inappropriate to give any advice to the new Dean at this time because we don't know who he is and we don't know how he wants to run the Faculty.

Prof. Sahni proposed that the Council mandate Steering Committee to provide recommendations on two questions: 1) what mechanism for decision-making will be introduced for the transition period; and 2) given the new structure what specific aspects would the Council like to see.

It was pointed out that we have a motion with a mandate from a previous meeting. That statement was followed by the suggestion that the last hour and a half had been spent in interpreting that motion. The new motion was withdrawn.

Dean Roy said that his impression was that Council is not expecting to receive any structure proposals in terms of models, that Council would like Steering Committee to gather data, develop job descriptions, prepare for contingency and transition and advisory committees, and to get the search committee structured in some way but not to come to specific grips with models of the Dean's Office.

Prof. Proppe stated that the word "model" was being used in a rather facile way and said that Steering Committee would have to organize whatever is brought to Council which to him means in some sense a certain model or options, and if he was being told that Steering Committee couldn't do that then he might as well resign from the Committee.

The Chairman was asked to read the original motion which was adopted by Council: "That Council ask the Steering Committee to plan for structure and transition of the Faculty".

Dean Chaikelson recalled that at that time it was said that if Steering Committee felt that it could not, or should not do it, it could come back to Council to ask that another committee be formed.

Prof. Proppe said that the reason he had sought clarification was in the hope that Prof. Langford would be satisfied that his perception of what the mandate should be is what Council is in fact telling us, and that he would reconsider his resignation.

Prof. Langford replied that his perception of the situation is that we have been cast into a position in which the Rector has moved to establish a general framework and structure of the Faculty of Arts and Science which while retaining one central concept from the outcome of the debates of the Faculty, essentially eliminated all the rest of the work Council had done, but since the Rector put that forward in a very vague and general framework the actual implementation is going to depend on who chooses to take the initiative, and it was his conception that Faculty Council, having spend a couple of years on the structure of the Faculty, would at this point choose to take an initiative to put on the table its preferences and its wishes in so far as they could be defined, that Council might take up the vacuum created by the fact that there isn't a Dean to put on the record some of its interests and preferences in the view that any reasonable candidate selected by a committee as distinguished as the one that was elected to select the Dean would be likely to produce an academic officer with a sensitivity to the internal dynamics of University Faculties and who would not ignore such a collection of recommendations. He did not see that the way Council is moving now as having anything to do with that and since he could not prevent himself from thinking that way he did not think that he could represent Council on its Steering Committee.

Dean Roy indicated that he was very concerned about Prof. Langford's resigning from Steering Committee because he thought that he had a particularly valuable role to play and he was anxious to try to persuade him not to resign, but he also suspected that Prof. Langford was very definite in his views on this matter.

Provost Singer called for a quorum count. There was a quorum present and the meeting proceeded.

Dean Chaikelson suggested that the discussion of exactly what Faculty Council is going to do would evolve as Steering Committee collects the information and it they think that it would be worthwhile to look at particular models they will have to tell Council that. She asked the other items on the agenda on the matter of the restructuring of the Faculty be considered.

85-5-6 At the request of Prof. Oppenheim a straw vote was taken of those who wished to discuss the handling of Council's resolution at the Board of Governors. The motion was defeated.

7. PROFESSOR EMERITUS (ASFC 85-3-2)

The Chairman reported that the item on Professor Emeritus is one which has been dealt with at Senate and that the intention was to get it to Council as an item of information and to ask members to take it back to their Departments for consideration and recommendations on criteria and prodedures by which "Professor Emeritus" might be granted. Dean Roy noted that the Senate document (US-85-2-D4) was not approved. It is a draft document around which discussion took place and he referred to the draft of the

Senate minutes on the item which was circulated with the proposal from Senate.

8. ELECTION PROCEDURES TO BE FOLLOWED IN THE APPOINTMENT OF THREE MEMBERS TO THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS (ASFC 85-3-D3)

Dean Roy referred to the memorandum addressed to him from the Secretary of the Board of Governors bringing to his notice that the terms of office of three representatives of the Faculty of Arts and Science come to an end May 31st and that the Faculty should conduct an election for the three seats. He noted that the Secretary of the Board suggested that the terms be staggered 1, 2, and 3 years and had attached to the memorandum an excerpt of the minutes of the Board meeting, February 8, 1979, in which the procedures by which elections are held for faculty members to the Board are outlined.

The Chairman reported that Steering Committee's recommendation, in view of the uncertainty associated with clusters or future structure of the Faculty, is that to elect for three-year terms may be inappropriate, nevertheless, the feeling is that there should be Divisional representation from Divisions I,II,III, two-year terms and that there be no more than one member from any Division. He outlined the issues as: 1) do we want to have staggered terms, or do we want fixed terms for everyone; 2) do we want the election to be carried out exactly in the same way as it was three years ago.

Provost Singer questioned the position of members of Division IV. He said that although it is true that on July 1st there will not be a Division IV, but there won't be other Divisions either. He made the point that there are exactly one hundred faculty members at the current time who are associated with some multi-disciplinary or interdisciplinary programme and while it is true that nearly all of them also have a base in a discipline, the notion was that the concept of multidisciplinary deserves some representation on such committees. Rather than exclude Division IV from those eligible to vote he said he would prefer to move to no Divisional representation and to elect three representatives faculty-wide with the only stipulation being that there should be no more than one from any Division.

Dean Chaikelson asked if there was time to hold three elections and she explained what she meant. Provost Singer reported that the last election required five hours and fifteen minutes to select four candidates from amongst 28 candidates and 24 ballots. In other words, every single Divisional election took one less round of balloting than the number of candidates. He did not think that the Elections Committee would be willing to run an election such as Dean Chaikelson had suggested.

Dean Chaikelson spoke against a faculty-wide election saying that because there are fewer people in Division III it is unlikely that a person from that Division would be elected in an open election.

Prof. Valaskakis spoke against one-year terms saying that it would place the Faculty in a weak position because it does take some time to get used to procedures and from that point of view it would be a mistake to have to change all members after one year.

Provost Singer repeated that the issue of divisions has come up before and he didn't think that there were many Division IV faculty present to defend themselves so he was going to call quorum.

The meeting was terminated.